



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and to the circumstances of our mundane life. Any collection of sane, acute, and suggestive ideas tending to show the feasibility of this quest, and to prove the joy of even partial success in it, adds to the fulness of life.

---

INDUSTRY AND HUMANITY. By W. L. Mackenzie King. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

What is first of all needed for the determination of industrial policy is a clear, controlling idea of the whole problem. We must have an essentially correct concept stated in simple, general terms such as will conform to and suggest both the practical and the moral factors.

Such a concept is supplied by Dr. King. Following Pasteur, the author distinguishes in human affairs, as within the human body, two conflicting laws or tendencies—the Law of Peace and Work and Health, and the Law of Blood and Death. According to this view, “all that begets strife and hatred in human relations” is of the nature of “disorder and ferment, akin to that evidenced by disease.”

This idea is as profound as it is simple, as hopeful as it is sane and evolutionary. Remove the *obstacles* to right action, and you will obtain inevitably *right action*. True, you cannot remove the obstacles all at once. Some of them are natural: they are merely limitations incident to an early stage of growth. But many of them are unnatural; they are curable diseases—the symptom of which is not simply that *crudity* of life which we see among savages and animals, but misery, with its accompaniments of bitterness, humiliation, weariness of life, which we rightly associate with civilization rather than with a “state of nature.” Conceive of humanity as an organism, and try to insure its healthy growth, with full faith in the reality of the organism and in its tendency to health.

All the more significance should be attached to this way of thinking because it is set forth on the authority of one who is not only a deep thinker but a practical statesman. For ten years, Dr. King was associated with the Department of Labor of the Government of Canada, first as Deputy Minister of the Department, and subsequently as Minister. During that time he was called upon to act as mediator in over forty strikes important enough to warrant intervention. The industries concerned embraced agencies of transportation and communication such as railroads, ocean transport, street railways, the telegraph and telephone; coal and metalliferous mining; and manufacturing establishments of various kinds. Dr. King was brought into close touch with a much larger number of controversies, and since the severance of his official connection with the Government he has continued to see much of important industrial disputes from the inside.

Considering these facts, too much emphasis cannot be given to the following deliberate and measured statement by Dr. King of his mature opinion:

... “I believe I can say that, without exception, every dispute and controversy of which I have had any intimate knowledge has owed its origin, and the difficulties pertaining to its settlement, not so much to the economic questions involved as to [a] ‘certain blindness in human beings’ to matters of real significance to other lives, and an unwilling

*ness to approach an issue with an attempt at appreciation of the fundamental sameness of feelings and aspirations in all human beings."*

What are the causes of this "certain blindness," which William James so lucidly analyzed? Fundamentally, as all thought is prompted by more or less hidden motives and goes on subject to more or less obscure limitations, one cannot reach logically every deep-seated cause of mistaken hostility. But there are certain external causes—certain wrong ideas—that can be thus reached and disproved.

One of these is the idea that workers, like the materials they work with and the tools they use, are simply means to an end. Means to an end they certainly are, as are all of us, but they are also, because human beings, ends in themselves. It is somehow difficult to keep in mind the conviction that they are *both*, and so to avoid the opposite extremes of sentimental socialism and selfish *laissez faire*. But modern life requires us to master knowledge of at least two dimensions.

Another wrong conception—which in one field, at least, has exploded in blood and smoke—is the false interpretation of the so-called law of "the survival of the fittest." Natural selection, of itself, is not sufficient to explain evolution—so the most advanced evolutionists agree. Still less can this law be recognized as excluding human intelligence from selection in human affairs, since our problem as conscious beings is just to select what is fittest *and to make it survive*. And in nothing is the choice more momentous than in the case of conflicting standards of living. The lower standard, through a kind of Gresham's Law, does tend to oust the higher; yet "through co-operative effort based on choice, higher standards may be made to prevail over inferior ones."

The real difficulty, however, is not so much to remove general misconceptions as to adjust industrial relations in such a manner as to minimize both the mental blindness which gives birth to fear and distrust and the fear and distrust which tend, in turn, to increase mental blindness.

In order to see how this may be done, we must have a clear analysis of the relations themselves.

Dr. King distinguishes four parties to industry—Labor, Capital, Management, and the Community. He designates the agencies of progress as Discovery and Invention, Government, Education, and Opinion. He defines the aim of his investigation as the discovery of right principles respecting Peace, Work, and Health.

Unfortunately, just at this point the exposition becomes, owing to cross-classification, a trifle tangled. What is referred to under Health would seem to belong quite as much to Peace, and what is said concerning Education and Opinion is so comprehensive that it might almost serve as an epitome of all. The whole treatise is, indeed, somewhat labored, somewhat disproportioned, somewhat heavily abstract. But these defects should blind no one to the profundity and fundamental clearness of Dr. King's ideas. The author is simply encumbered by the weight and the copiousness of his own thoughts—and, indeed, perfect ease and shapeliness are too often merely the virtues of those writers who handle with great facility the thoughts of others!

One of the leading principles underlying Work is this: "With a larger product, there is the possibility of increased returns, *not to one*

*factor at the expense of others, but to all at the expense of none."* Once this is thoroughly comprehended, a further misconception is cleared away, and the road seems logically open to adjustment with the aim of securing the utmost efficiency with the greatest prosperity for all.

Of very great interest is the author's discussion of the various means of adjustment that have been tried; for in this, one perceives the working of a principle. Compulsory Arbitration, though logical, does not work well in practice. Voluntary arbitration is but slightly better. Mediation and conciliation are decidedly better, but not always workable. Compulsory investigation has worked on the whole better than any other expedient. "The number of disputes which have been amicably adjusted under the Canadian Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, without loss of a dollar to Capital, a day's wake to Labor, or a moment's inconvenience to the public, is so considerable as to constitute the vast majority of the cases which have been referred under its provisions."

Profit-sharing, on the other hand—and here the author agrees with those who have studied the matter carefully from the point of view of management—is of very limited use; the reason being that it is in practice not so much an application of principle as a mere palliative or device. Labor's suspicion of profit-sharing, the author acknowledges, is more or less well founded.

That method is best, in short, which goes farthest in destroying suspicion, in invoking public opinion, and in conserving independence.

And so the best method of all would seem to be Industrial Representation—democracy in industry.

This is the practical idea which looms largest in Dr. King's book, and which is indeed the logical outcome of his discussion.

Already a beginning has been made toward securing industrial democracy. The Rockefeller Industrial Plan, the recommendations of the Whitley Committee in England, are both based upon this principle. If Dr. King had done no more than to explain adequately these two plans, and to set them in their true light, drawing out the profoundly interesting parallel between the progress they mark and the development of political freedom in English history, his book would still be of immense value.

He has done all this and more. He has written what is perhaps the most truly philosophical, and hence the most practical, of books concerning the industrial problem.

---

THE LETTERS OF ANNE GILCHRIST AND WALT WHITMAN. Edited by Thomas B. Harned. Garden City.: Doubleday, Page & Company.

Only a sentimental schoolgirl could fall in love with Keats, with Shelley, with Tennyson, merely through reading his poems. The personality of the poet is in his works, but in an etherealized form: he makes us think of beauty, not of his personality.

Whitman's personality is in his work in a different sense. The whole man is there—virile personality, warm affection, democratic bluster, along with the great thought. And so Anne Gilchrist did not need to meet Whitman face to face in order to fall in love with him.